Brevard Public Schools

Sculptor Charter School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sculptor Charter School

1301 ARMSTRONG DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.sculptorcharter.org

Demographics

Principal: Renee Bernhard

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Sculptor Charter School

1301 ARMSTRONG DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.sculptorcharter.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-8	No	29%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	17%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Sculpting Young Minds to Shape the Future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sculptor Charter School will develop culturally literate citizens who are successful in the real world by delivering a world class education in a collaborative environment with a passion for learning.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bernhard, Renee	Principal	*Instructional leader focused on student achievement. *Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement. *Encourages others to collaborate. *Uses data to improve learning. *Provides support to all staff, particularly Instructional staff. *Provides feedback to Instructional staff *Assists in aligning curriculum, assessment, and instruction. *Provides and allocates resources. *Uses data to determine staff professional development activities to strengthen instructional skills.
Quam, Christine	Assistant Principal	*Instructional leader focused on student achievement. *Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement. *Encourages others to collaborate. *Uses data to improve learning. *Provides support to all staff, particularly Instructional staff. *Provides feedback to Instructional staff *Assists in aligning curriculum, assessment, and instruction. *Provides and allocates resources. *Uses data to determine staff professional development activities to strengthen instructional skills. *Testing coordinator
Hoogerwerf, Michelle	School Counselor	*Provides counseling services to students to ensure their mental health needs are being met. *Assists in developing and implementing behavior plans, as needed. *Instrumental in the MTSS process *Collaborates with others to develop strategies to improve student achievement. *Encourages others to collaborate. *Uses data to improve learning. *Provides support to instructional staff as they work through the IPST/ MTSS process.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/1/2017, Renee Bernhard

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (66%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	56	53	55	60	67	69	68	67	58	0	0	0	0	553
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	2	9	9	9	8	2	6	0	0	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	5	9	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	54	53	58	58	66	65	70	63	62	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	13	10	7	7	13	10	18	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	5	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	4	11	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	54	53	58	58	66	65	70	63	62	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	13	10	7	7	13	10	18	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	5	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	4	11	8	6	1	0	0	0	0	40

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	74%	65%	61%	74%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	58%	59%	63%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	54%	54%	53%	53%	51%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	70%	67%	62%	61%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	66%	62%	59%	57%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	59%	52%	53%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	70%	62%	56%	64%	62%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	80%	78%	90%	82%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	64%	12%	58%	18%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
	2018	76%	57%	19%	56%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	76%	60%	16%	56%	20%
	2018	62%	54%	8%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	58%	60%	-2%	54%	4%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
07	2019	75%	58%	17%	52%	23%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	51%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	79%	63%	16%	56%	23%
	2018	67%	65%	2%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	67%	59%	8%	62%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	64%	60%	4%	60%	4%
	2018	53%	58%	-5%	61%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	60%	67%	-7%	55%	5%
	2018	75%	68%	7%	52%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-15%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
07	2019	76%	62%	14%	54%	22%
	2018	72%	62%	10%	54%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	81%	43%	38%	46%	35%
	2018	56%	41%	15%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
	2018	49%	57%	-8%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		27%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	64%	53%	11%	48%	16%
	2018	51%	55%	-4%	50%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	74%	9%	71%	12%
2018	92%	73%	19%	71%	21%
Compare		-9%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	61%	36%	61%	36%
2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Compare		32%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	95%	60%	35%	57%	38%
2018	93%	60%	33%	56%	37%
Compare		2%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	55	55	56	57	66	69	43				
HSP	84	77		77	69		92				
MUL	68	57		68	53		42	80			
WHT	74	65	60	70	67	59	71	85	72		
FRL	72	65	64	72	67	62	68	86	55		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	62	56	65	46	52	53	36				
HSP	78	59		69	74		45				
MUL	74	65		68	73						
WHT	71	57	53	68	64	58	51	94	69		
FRL	63	53	47	63	66	59	19	91	55		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	55	50	48	39	45	48	47				
HSP	73	56		69	46		45				
MUL	70	63		59	54		75				
WHT	75	64	57	61	58	58	66	93	78		
FRL	61	59	63	60	56	60	53	93	75		

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	620
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	61
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	69
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	68
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

From 2017-18 to 2018-19, the data component showing the lowest performance was 3rd grade math. Since the teachers and curriculum were the same as in prior years and student performance was previously higher, the only thing that was different was the students themselves.

FAIR scores from Assessment period 1 of the 2020-2021 school year show that only 28% of the current 8th graders have a Probability of Literacy Success score of 85% or greater.

.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

In looking at FAIR scores for Assessment period 1 of the 2020-2021 school year, the Probability of Literacy Success decreased across most grade levels from where the students were during Assessment Period 2 of the 2019-2020 school year. This holds true not just across the grade levels, but also across most of the grade level cohorts. The grade level cohort seeing the largest decline would be the students currently in 8th grade. In AP 2, when the students were in 7th grade, 52% of the students scored with a Probability of Literacy success of 85% or greater. At the beginning of the 2020-2021 school year, only 28% of those same students scored 85% or higher.

Data from previous FSA scores (from 2017-18 to 2018-19) showed:
* a decline of 28% in 3rd grade math. Since the teachers and curriculum were the same as in previous years, this particular group of students did not perform well in math.
* Sixth grade ELA had a significant decline as well (down 14%). But, the cohort comparison showed their performance to be exactly the same as the year prior.
* In Math, 6th grade showed a decline of 15%, but the cohort showed an increase of 7%. It is possible because we focused so heavily on Math, less focus may have been on ELA.
* Our lowest 25% students in Math showed a decline (62% made gains in 2018 vs 57% in 2019)
* Civics showed a decline of 9%

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Previous FSA scores(2018-2019):
Algebra EOC - 36% higher than state average; Geometry - 38% higher than state average. 8th grade math - 35% higher than state average. All grades, except 3rd grade, performed higher than the state average in Math.
ELA-All grades performed higher than the state average.
Science-both grader (5th and 8th) scored higher than the state average (5th-23% higher; 8th 16% higher).
Civics-our average was still 12% higher than the state average.
In 2018-2019, we had an increased focus on Math and Science and provided professional development for the teachers in these subjects. In Science, we realigned our curriculum to the Standards to ensure all standards were being taught appropriately. In addition, we had an administrative intern from NASA who was instrumental in providing feedback to the Science teachers regarding tested standards.
Throughout 2019-2020, we continued our focus on Math and Science even through distance learning.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Comparing FSA scores from 2017-2018 and 2018-2019:
Algebra EOC - increase of 32% over 2018, Over the summer of 2020, we had 5 students opt to take the Algebra EOC exam. All students passed the EOC, in spite of participating in distance learning for the 4th nine weeks.
5th grade Science - increase of 27% over 2018
8th grade Science - increase of 13% over 2018; cohort increased 51%.
Among subgroups:
SWD increased performance over 2018 in Math (11%) and Science (7%).
Hispanic students increased performance in ELA (6%), Math (8%), and Science (47%).
FRL students also increased performance in ELA (9%), Math (9%), and Science (20%).

We continued a heavy focus on Math, but also added a focus on Science. We ensured curriculum and instruction were aligned with the standards, particularly with Science. We had an Administrative intern from NASA who was instrumental in providing feedback to the Science teachers regarding tested standards.

Comparing FAIR scores from AP2 from 2019-20 to AP 1 2020-2021, the cohort rising to 7th grade showed that 62% of the current 7th graders showed a Probability of Literacy Success of 85% or greater in 2020-21 vs only 32% of the students in AP2 of 2019-2020.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

In 2019-2020, The number of students with attendance below 90% decreased to 53 (vs 98 in 2018-2019) and students with one or more suspensions decreased from 15 to 5. This huge decrease is likely due to the fact that schools were shut down for more than two months. When comparing the number of days lost due to suspensions and only considering the time period from August, 2018-March, 2019 as compared to August, 2019-March, 2020, there is still a decrease in days lost: In school suspensions decreased in 2018-19-from 18 to 12 in 2019-20; Out of school suspensions (days out) also decreased-from 25 in 2018-19 to 20 in 2019-2020.

In looking at the Discipline data from August, 2018-March, 2019 as compared to August, 2019-March 2020, overall discipline events were reduced from 104 in the 2018-2019 school year to 82 in the 2019-2020 school year.

The number of students with two or more EWS indicators remained the same at 6. For the 2020-21 school year, two areas of concern continue to be: 1) decreasing the number of students with two or more indicators; and 2) decreasing the number of students with attendance less than 90%.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase level of performance in ELA across all grade levels.
2 Maintain growth in Math and Science..
3. Continue to reduce suspensions and the number of students with attendance greater than 90%.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Over the last 2 years, our ELA data has been strong with the average percentage of students scoring Level 3 or above being higher (in 2019-74%; 2018-72%) than that of the state (2019-61%; 2018 60%) and/or the District (2019-65%; 2018-68%). However, recent FAIR scores show that proficiency may have been lost while schools/students participated in remote learning. The average percentage of students having a Probability of Literacy Success greater than 85% was 42.50 in 2919-20 (assessment period 2, which was in February), but only 40.0 in the current assessment period 1 of 2020-2021. In addition, in looking at specific areas, both reading comprehension and vocabulary were areas that decreased across most grade level cohorts. “Reading comprehension draws on a broad range of skills and habits. Background knowledge and a deep vocabulary are two of the most critical ingredients in becoming a good reader.” (Reading Rockets). Therefore, it is critical that we focus on providing domain specific vocabulary and appropriate background knowledge in order to increase reading comprehension.
Measurable Outcome:	The average percentage of students with a Probability of Literacy Success of 85% or greater will increase from 40.00 to 45%. Also, per our charter goals we will continue to meet or exceed the FSA Mean Scale Score of the District and/or State in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Core Knowledge curriculum, including the Core Knowledge Language Arts program, will be implemented with fidelity. As a part of this program, the following strategies will be utilized: * Higher level questioning will be utilized throughout lessons in order to determine students' level of understanding and to encourage students to think critically. * Vocabulary instruction will be intentional with the focus being to develop fluency and reading comprehension. An emphasis will be on providing students with rich background knowledge, which will assist with reading comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading comprehension is key to successful achievement across all academic areas. According the E.D. Hirsch, founder/developer of Core Knowledge, in order for students to understand what they are reading (in any content area), they must first have the background knowledge to understand the content. Implementing the Core Knowledge curriculum, including the Core Knowledge Language Arts Program, with fidelity will assist in providing students with the background knowledge necessary for increased vocabulary retention and successful reading comprehension. In regards to higher level questioning, students who truly comprehend written material will be able to think critically to analyze those questions and make connections with the real world.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Weekly classroom walk-throughs/observations and monthly meetings with teachers will be implemented by
both the Assistant Principal and Principal. Lesson plans will be reviewed and discussed in monthly meetings.
2. Provide online professional development for ELA programs, such as NewsELA, iStation, and Reading A to

Z.
3. Progress monitor through online programs, such as FAIR and iStation, as well as through written assessments, such as Quarterly Literacy Assessments (District assessment). ELearners will be brought into the building to participate in progress monitoring.
4. Provide eLearners with synchronous instruction in Reading and all subject areas so the level and quality of
instruction is the same as the face-to-face learners experience.

Person Responsible Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order to maintain and continue our growth in Math, we need to ensure standards based instruction and continued professional development in math is a priority. All grades showed growth in Math on the 2019 FSA, except 3rd grade (which had a 28% decline) and 6th grade (which had a 15% decline in the grade level-but a 7% gain in the cohort. 8th grade math showed gains for 25%; Algebra EOC had gains of 32%. In 2020-21, all 5 of our students that took the Algebra EOC over the summer passed with at least a Level 3-even though their last 9 weeks was spent in distance learning. While we are still progress monitoring students, early assessments show gaps in what students retained from the 2019-20 school year, especially in Math.
Measurable Outcome:	95% of the instructional staff responsible for teaching math will: 1) ensure the Eureka Math/ Engage NY program is aligned to the current standards; and 2) demonstrate effective implementation of the Eureka Math/Engage NY curriculum. Per our charter goals, we will continue to meet or exceed the Mean Scale Score of the District and/or the State in Math. All grade levels or cohorts will show at least 2% growth in Math, as measured by the Math FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will ensure students are: * Actively engaged in doing mathematics (focusing on both eLearners and face to face learners) * Solving challenging problems * Making inter-disciplinary connections * Sharing mathematical ideas * Using multiple representations to communicate mathematical ideas * Using manipulatives and other tools.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has shown that the above strategies should be seen in an effective math classroom (Protheroe, 2007). We have utilized these strategies over the last few years that our focus has been on Math. Since we have seen continued improvements in students achievement, we are going to continue the use of these strategies. Because approximately 35% of our students are participating in eLearning, it is more important than ever that these strategies be employed in all classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide new teachers with initial Professional development in Eureka Math/Engage NY.
2. Continue to provide veteran teachers with support in both Engage NY/Eureka Math and Algebra Nation.
3. Meet with teachers monthly to discuss student achievement in Math.
4. Utilize the MTSS process to provide interventions to those students making insufficient progress.
5. Utilize online programs for both reinforcement of mathematical concepts, as well as progress monitoring,
with all learners.
6. Assist eLearners through "breakout rooms." This will allow the teacher to work with individuals, as well as
small groups of students in a virtual environment.
7. Ensure all learners, including eLearners, are actively participating in lessons and completing classwork/projects.
8. Provide parents with feedback regarding student progress through virtual conferences.

Person Responsible	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2018-2019, we placed a huge focus on Science and saw tremendous growth on the subsequent Science Assessment over the previous year. This focus on standards based instruction helped us realize these gains. 5th grade Science had gains of 25%; 8th grade Science had gains of 13%.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of the Science teachers in grades 4-8 will participate in the Science cadre. This cadre will continue to ensure proper alignment of the science curriculum to the standards. The cadre will also ensure that science assessments are grade level appropriate and standards based. Per our charter goals, we will continue to meet or exceed the Mean Scale Score of that of the District and/or State on the FSA Science Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	* Teachers will set clear lesson goals and standards-based learning objectives for Science instruction. * Teachers will consistently track student progress using standards-based questioning and assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers set clear goals, they can intentionally plan their instruction and their activities. Marzano's research is clear that students need to know what learning targets they are intended to master. Ensuring these learning targets are based on the appropriate grade level standards (instead of based on just an area a teacher likes to teach) will help students continue making learning gains in Science.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchase a new Science curriculum for grades 6-8 to more adequately align to both the Florida Standards and to Core Knowledge Science expectations. This new curriculum also needs to be online based so that eLearners can easily participate and have access to content.
2. Science teachers will administer standards-based assessments as a progress monitoring tool.
3. Monthly meetings will be held with the Science teachers to discuss lesson plans and student progress.
4. Labs and other hands-on learning opportunities will continue to be provided to all students - using safe practices: all students have individual materials; materials are sanitized after each use; eLearners are able to participate in the labs at home or are provided an alternate assignment.
5. Virtual labs are observed by all learners through Generation Genius; discussion is then able to be held with all learners participating.

Person Responsible	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In order for students to be successful, they need to believe that we truly care about them. If students believe that we care, attendance and discipline rates should improve. Relationship building will be more challenging this year due to the fact that many students are learning at home and not here in our building. We began implementing Restorative Practices, at a very basic level, in 2019. In 2019, students with absences greater than 90% were reduced by 10 (from 108 to 98). Suspensions also decreased by 6 (from 21 to 15). While it's hard to compare the data from 2019-2020 due the fact that schools were closed for 2.5 months, in looking at the Discipline data from August, 2018-March, 2019 as compared to August, 2019-March 2020, overall discipline events were reduced from 104 in the 2018-2019 school year to 82 in the 2019-2020 school year. Attendance over the same period of time was fairly consistent - from August, 2018-March, 2019, the attendance percentage was 95.6; from August, 2019 - March, 2020, the attendance percentage was 95.52. In school suspensions decreased for the same time period in 2018-19-from 18 to 12 in 2019-20; Out of school suspensions (days out) also decreased-from 25 in 2018-19 to 20 in 2019-2020. With more than 150 students utilizing the eLearning option, absences and tardies among eLearners have been challenging. While some tardies, for example, have been due to technical issues, others have been due to students not wishing to participate. We need to ensure these students feel included and part of the school community in order to reduce these absences and tardies.
Measurable Outcome:	Student absences will be reduced by 2%; suspensions will also be reduced by 2%. ELearning tardies and absences will improve in the 2nd nine weeks by 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Restorative Practices will continue to be implemented. In addition, the PATHS program and Student Success Skills (both research/evidenced based programs) will be implemented to assist with social emotional learning needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The purpose of continuing Restorative Practices is for students to reflect on behavior, restore relationships, and make restitution as needed. This will also assist with relationship building as more teachers learn to implement restorative circles in their classrooms. Implementing an SEL curriculum will allow specific skills to be taught to all students and provide them with tools to utilize during difficult times.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide training to teacher leaders in Restorative Practices.
2. Provide training in PATHS and Student Success Skills
3. Teachers will implement Restorative Circles in their classrooms and/or utilize restorative practices techniques to help students resolve situations that develop.
4. Teachers will implement the SEL curriculum (either PATHS or Student Success Skills). This will be verified through monthly meetings with teachers.
5. Our guidance counselor will continue to reach out to the eLearners to help support their mental health needs.

6. Teachers/Administration will ensure eLearners remain involved in the school community: eLearners choosing to run for Student Council will be able to participate virtually; eLearners will be able to participate electronically in the school-wide mock election; eLearners will be encouraged to dress up in the "theme of the day" during Spirit week; teachers/Administration will make home visits, as appropriate, to deliver items, etc.

Person Responsible	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While most of our subgroups showed gains in all subject areas, two subgroups showed declines in ELA. Students with Disabilities (SWD) had a decline in the percentage of students demonstrating proficiency (level 3 or higher) from 2018 (62%) to 2019 (55%). The subgroup Multiracial also showed a drop in student proficiency. In 2018, 74% of students scored Level 3 or higher on FSA; in 2019, only 68% of multiracial students scored level 3 or higher. In order to remain in compliance, all subgroups must show that at least 41% of students are performing at grade level (level 3 or higher). While the subgroups SWD and multiracial have considerably more than 41% of students that score Level 3 or higher, because these groups showed a decline in proficiency, we need to work with these students to identify gaps and provide interventions to close the gaps.
Measurable Outcome:	Both SWD and multiracial students will show an increase of 5% in the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 or above in ELA; Students with Disabilities and multiracial students will improve in Reading comprehension, as measured by FAIR-FS, by 5 percentile points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Bernhard (bernhard.renee@sculptorcharter.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will be supported through the MTSS process and provided with appropriate interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In Hattie's effect size list, Response to Intervention (Differentiated Teaching) was shown to have a great impact on student achievement - with an effect size of 1.29.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Students with Disabilities and multiracial students not performing at grade level as measured by FAIR-FS, will be identified.
2. At risk students will participate in targeted, small-group instruction in Reading Comprehension during RTI by a Reading Endorsed/Certified teacher.
3. Progress will be assessed and monitored.
4. If needed, further interventions will be utilized to meet the needs of each student.

Person Responsible	Christine Quam (quam.chris@sculptorcharter.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

All areas of focus were addressed in the above section.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Sculptor builds a positive school culture and environment in several ways. We have been working to implement Restorative Practices over the last year and we have subscribed to the Love and Logic philosophy. Both of these help us build positive relationships with our students and even our families. We recently purchased an SEL curriculum for both the Elementary (Paths) and Middle school (Student Success Skills). We believe that by meeting the social and emotional needs of our students, this will help us maintain a positive school culture.

In addition, we receive feedback from our stakeholders (families) through an annual survey. We look at the feedback provided to try and determine areas that can be improved and areas that we need to continue, as they are working.

Families are required to perform 20 hours of volunteer service at Sculptor each year. Since volunteers are not yet allowed in the building (as of first semester), we will be working with our families during second semester to help them complete as many hours as they are able, while recognizing that many families may not be able to meet the full requirement this year. Our PTO is normally quite active in assisting teachers and staff with fundraising activities and other volunteer opportunities within the school. Families also are able to participate on the School Advisory Council and help sponsor various after-school clubs/activities.

This current year is a challenge in maintaining staff morale. We are looking at programs to help us decrease the amount of stress that our staff is under, especially the teachers, as they are having to teach both eLearners and face-to-face kids at the same time.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.